



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,347	07/28/2003	Victor Ciccarelli	ARC11.012	6349
63973	7590	07/24/2009		
KEITH D. NOWAK CARTER LEDYARD & MILBURN LLP 2 WALL STREET NEW YORK, NY 10005				
EXAMINER				
PHAM, THIERRY L				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2625				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/24/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/629,347

Applicant(s)

CICCARELLI, VICTOR

Examiner

THIERRY L. PHAM

Art Unit

2625

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) THIERRY L. PHAM.(3) Troy DeBaal.(2) Lawrence White.(4) Libby Varghese(5) Edward Coles

Date of Interview: 20 July 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: Demonstration includes the differences between the prior art [manually entering the scale information on the header] and applicant's claimed invention (using the embedded scale information without having to manually enter the scale information for measurement).

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: US 6134338 to Solberg et al; US 20020077787 to Rappaport et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussions include (1) how the proposed combination of prior arts would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified; (2) the differences between the prior arts cited and claimed invention [embedded scale information in the header]; (3) the proposed amendment to claim 1; (4) demonstration of how embedded scale information works.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Thierry L Pham/
Examiner of Art Unit 2625